

Madam Speaker, we have to understand if a school district's average per pupil expenditure might be \$7,500, a special needs child may be \$15,000, may be \$20,000, may be \$100,000, the local school district has had to pick up most of that extra expenditure, even though we said we would send 40 percent of the excess costs.

Well, depending where you are, just in a small city, like I represent, in York, Pennsylvania, if we were sending them 40 percent of excess costs, they would get a million dollars extra every year. They could talk about teacher quality. They could talk about pupil-teacher ratio reduction. They could talk about improving their school buildings, because they would be getting what was promised.

And for 20 years I pleaded and pleaded and pleaded and pleaded and got nowhere. Finally, we started making some improvements. But not because of the President's budget, because the last 2 years he sent a budget up that reduced our spending on special education, if we consider the number of new students that come in and we include inflation.

Fortunately, by the time we were finished going through the authorization process and the appropriations process, we have dramatically increased that expenditure so that those local school districts then can get this money and spend it on the special needs children, without totally raising all of that money on the local level and taking it away from every other education program.

Our Teacher Accountability Act supports local decision-making, provides greater flexibility, reforming the tenure system, tests teachers, provides for signing bonuses or differential pay for teachers in high-needs subject areas, provides incentives to teachers with a record of success in helping low-achievement students improve their academic success, helps them recruit fully qualified teachers, rewards schools and local education agencies for reducing the number of unqualified teachers that are teaching in their schools, helps them hire quality teachers and provide quality professional development.

Now, contrast that, again, with what the administration would do. The new Washington control programs address many of the same issues that I just mentioned, but the programs will be directed by bureaucrats in Washington and not based on peculiar needs of each local school district.

Washington will decide who receives the funds. Washington will decide the amount of funds that are needed to address a specific problem. Washington will dictate how the funds must be spent.

We are moving in the right direction, and I am hopeful that by the time we finish reauthorization of the Elemen-

tary Secondary Education Act we, in the near future, will begin to see a closing of that academic achievement gap. Something that was well intentioned with the legislation in 1965; unfortunately, it has not worked.

This is a chart indicating just what we have been able to do, what the President has said in relationship to the funding for special ed and what we were able to do in the House and the Senate in the appropriation process. Here we see 1997, and the yellow is the President's request. The orange is what we were able to do. We got up above \$3 million in 1997 for special ed money going back. In 1998, this was the President's request. This is what we were able to do in the Congress.

In 1999, we can again see we went up. And in the year 2000, the present year that we are in, we are now up to \$5 million that will go back to these local school districts.

IDEA funding is probably the most important thing we can do to help local school districts because it gives them, then, the opportunity to use the hard-earned tax money that they have to go out and get for their entire education program.

As I mentioned, my small city of York would receive a million dollars extra. Let me talk about a couple of the other areas.

Los Angeles, for instance, they actually receive \$23 million. If they got the 40 percent of excess costs, they would get \$118 million. That would free up \$95 million that they must raise locally to meet these Federal mandates.

Chicago, \$41 million. If they got their 40 percent they would get \$212 million. It would give them \$170 million. And they have taken great steps in Chicago to try to improve that school system to make sure that all of those children have an opportunity to achieve and get a piece of the American dream.

New York City, \$41 million. \$212 million, 170 million if they got the 40 percent.

In Miami, they receive \$10 million. With 40 percent, they would get \$55 million. That means a 44 million increase.

Washington, D.C., right where we are, they get \$3 million. If they got the 40 percent, they would get \$15 million. \$12 million locally in order to improve the academic achievement of all their students.

In St. Louis, they get \$2 million. If they got 40 percent, they would get \$10 million, and that is again a dramatic increase for them to use to improve their schools locally.

So large cities across this country would see a dramatic increase; and, therefore, we do not have to go out and tell them we want them to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio, we want them to have a qualified teacher, we want them to improve their school building. They would have the money to do it. We

take that money from them with our mandate because we do not send what we promised we would send.

Again, I hope by the time we finish the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the near future, we will see that gap closed. It is tragic to see as many as 50 percent of our students not receiving the education they will need to compete in the 21st century.

□ 1615

Last year I had to cast one of the worst votes I had to cast. We needed to change our immigration laws so that we could bring qualified people in to do the jobs that exist in this country, in this high-tech 21st Century. What a tragedy. What a tragedy. I hope no one will ever have to cast a vote of that nature in the future, because I hope we will do something about making sure that that 50 percent that are not getting an opportunity to get a part of this 21st Century American dream will get that opportunity.

The answers are at the local level with State efforts. We are here to add assistance. We should not be here to complicate the problems that they have on the State and local level. I think by the time we pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and it becomes law, we will be on the right road to ensure academic achievement for all students no matter where they live, who they are, no matter what their disability may be. All will have an opportunity for a quality education.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1801

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

INDIAN TRIBAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CONTRACT ENCOURAGEMENT ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 613.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the

rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 613, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie	Davis (VA)	Horn
Ackerman	Deal	Hostettler
Aderholt	DeFazio	Houghton
Allen	DeGette	Hoyer
Andrews	Delahunt	Hunter
Archer	DeLauro	Hutchinson
Armey	DeLay	Hyde
Baca	DeMint	Insee
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Isakson
Baird	Dickey	Istook
Baker	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Baldacci	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Baldwin	Dixon	(TX)
Ballenger	Doggett	Jefferson
Barcia	Dooley	Jenkins
Barr	Doolittle	John
Barrett (NE)	Doyle	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (WI)	Dreier	Johnson, E. B.
Bartlett	Duncan	Johnson, Sam
Bass	Dunn	Jones (NC)
Bateman	Edwards	Jones (OH)
Becerra	Ehlers	Kanjorski
Bentsen	Emerson	Kasich
Bereuter	Engel	Kelly
Berkley	English	Kennedy
Berman	Eshoo	Kildee
Berry	Etheridge	Kind (WI)
Biggart	Evans	King (NY)
Bilbray	Everett	Kingston
Bilirakis	Ewing	Klecza
Bishop	Farr	Klink
Blagojevich	Fattah	Knollenberg
Bliley	Filner	Kolbe
Blumenauer	Fletcher	Kucinich
Blunt	Foley	Kuykendall
Boehlert	Forbes	LaFalce
Boehner	Ford	LaHood
Bonilla	Fossella	Lampson
Bonior	Fowler	Lantos
Bono	Frank (MA)	Largent
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Larson
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Latham
Boucher	Frost	LaTourette
Boyd	Galleghy	Lazio
Brady (PA)	Ganske	Leach
Brady (TX)	Gejdenson	Lee
Brown (FL)	Gekas	Levin
Bryant	Gephardt	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Burton	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Buyer	Gilman	Linder
Callahan	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Calvert	Goode	LoBiondo
Camp	Goodlatte	Lowe
Canady	Goodling	Lucas (KY)
Cannon	Gordon	Lucas (OK)
Capuano	Goss	Luther
Cardin	Graham	Maloney (CT)
Carson	Granger	Maloney (NY)
Castle	Green (TX)	Manzullo
Chabot	Green (WI)	Markey
Chambliss	Greenwood	Martinez
Clay	Gutierrez	Mascara
Clayton	Gutknecht	Matsui
Clement	Hall (OH)	McCarthy (MO)
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	McCarthy (NY)
Coble	Hansen	McCollum
Coburn	Hastings (FL)	McCrery
Collins	Hastings (WA)	McDermott
Combest	Hayes	McGovern
Condit	Hayworth	McHugh
Conyers	Hefley	McInnis
Cooksey	Herger	McIntosh
Costello	Hill (IN)	McIntyre
Cox	Hill (MT)	McKeon
Coyne	Hilleary	McKinney
Cramer	Hilliard	McNulty
Crane	Hinche	Meehan
Crowley	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Cubin	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Cummings	Hoefl	Menendez
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Metcalf
Danner	Holden	Mica
Davis (FL)	Holt	Miller (FL)
Davis (IL)	Hooley	Miller, George

Minge	Rodriguez	Sununu
Mink	Roemer	Sweeney
Moakley	Rogan	Talent
Mollohan	Rogers	Tancred
Moore	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Moran (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Moran (VA)	Rothman	Tauzin
Morella	Roukema	Taylor (MS)
Myrick	Royce	Taylor (NC)
Nadler	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Napolitano	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Neal	Sabo	Thompson (CA)
Nethercutt	Salmon	Thompson (MS)
Ney	Sanchez	Thornberry
Northup	Sanders	Thune
Norwood	Sandlin	Thurman
Nussle	Sanford	Tiahrt
Oberstar	Sawyer	Tierney
Obey	Saxton	Toomey
Oliver	Scarborough	Towns
Ortiz	Schaffer	Trafficant
Ose	Schakowsky	Turner
Packard	Scott	Udall (CO)
Pallone	Sensenbrenner	Udall (NM)
Pascarella	Serrano	Upton
Pastor	Sessions	Velázquez
Payne	Shadegg	Visclosky
Pease	Shaw	Vitter
Pelosi	Shays	Walden
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Walsh
Peterson (PA)	Sherwood	Wamp
Petri	Shuster	Watkins
Phelps	Simpson	Watt (NC)
Pickering	Sisisky	Watts (OK)
Pickett	Skeen	Waxman
Pitts	Skelton	Weiner
Pombo	Slaughter	Weldon (FL)
Pomeroy	Smith (MI)	Weldon (PA)
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Weller
Price (NC)	Smith (TX)	Weygand
Pryce (OH)	Smith (WA)	Whitfield
Quinn	Snyder	Wicker
Radanovich	Souder	Wilson
Rahall	Spence	Wise
Ramstad	Spratt	Wolf
Rangel	Stabenow	Woolsey
Regula	Stark	Wu
Reyes	Stearns	Wynn
Reynolds	Stenholm	Young (AK)
Riley	Stump	Young (FL)
Rivers	Stupak	

NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage

Strickland

NOT VOTING—26

Barton	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Lofgren	Rush
Campbell	Millender	Shimkus
Capps	McDonald	Shows
Cook	Miller, Gary	Vento
Deutsch	Murtha	Waters
Ehrlich	Owens	Wexler
Gibbons	Oxley	
Hulshof	Paul	
Kaptur	Portman	

□ 1825

Mr. STRICKLAND changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for rollcall vote No. 26 because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous commitment in my district, I was absent for rollcall vote No. 26.

Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber today during

rollcall vote No. 26 on S. 613. Had I been present I would have voted “yea.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALDACC. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 16, 2000, I was traveling in my district with Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, examining the devastating impact that high fuel and heating oil prices are having on Maine people. As a result, I missed four votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following way:

Rollcall vote 22, yea; rollcall vote 23, nay; rollcall vote 24, aye; and rollcall vote 25, no.

GIL HODGES BELONGS IN BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

(Mr. WEINER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Bay News in Brooklyn had this headline on their newspaper. It says, “Get Gil In. Brooklynites Demand, Put Hodges in the Hall of Fame.”

Well, today, the veterans committee of major league baseball announced, once again, that Gil Hodges had been passed over. This is an outrage.

In fact, we all know that Gil Hodges was the first major league player to ever hit four home runs in a game. And those of us who are Met fans know that he was the first Met to ever hit a home run and, of course, the manager of the “Miracle Mets” of 1969.

But even the casual baseball fan knows that Gil Hodges deserves to be in the Hall of Fame. They know that he ranks 38 in home runs, with over 370; six seasons with 30-plus home runs. He hit twice, more than 40 home runs. He had a lifetime slugging percentage of nearly 500, and nine times he exceeded a 500 slugging percentage. He was a Gold Glove winner. He played on seven pennant winners and two World Series champions.

He was a hero to the people of Brooklyn and a baseball player that deserves to be in the Hall of Fame.

The Bay News said, “Get Gil In.” All Brooklynites agree. The Committee on Veterans Affairs’ should heed that call.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

U.S., INDIA, AND CHINA: TIME FOR NEW RELATIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.